From:	REDACTED on behalf of "Jonna Mazet" <jkmazet@ucdavis.edu>
Sent:	08/01/2017 12:10:01 PM (-07:00)
To:	"Kevin Olival, PhD" <olival@ecohealthalliance.org>
Cc:	"David J Wolking" <djwolking@ucdavis.edu>; "Peter Daszak" <daszak@ecohealthalliance.org>; "Anna Willoughby" <willoughby@ecohealthalliance.org>; "Evelyn Luciano" <luciano@ecohealthalliance.org>
Subject:	Re: Upcoming PREDICT-related paper in MDPI journal Diversity
Attachments:	PREDICT_SOP_PREDICT Policies and Plans_v.25Aug2016.pdf

Hi Kevin,

I'll try to give you a call to discuss options, but it sounds like we're philosophically aligned and just need to sort this one out. That said, I'd also appreciate if you make sure the philosophy permeates the whole EHA organization and that everyone is getting the message. I know people had some major cringes over Maureen and Emily's last pub, as it contained a huge amount of information generated collaboratively through the Predict proposal development and P-1, and no coauthors were included, even the consortium, nor was Predict even acknowledged. So we do maybe need to have a repeated philosophy sharing plan with your HQ team, especially junior people who wouldn't be expected to know better without being specifically told. I love that students and junior people are taking the lead on some of these, we just want to make sure to mentor them properly, mention the products at the EB level, and be inclusive to the extent possible/appropriate with coauthorship. To that end, you may want to share the attachment HQ-wide as a reminder.

I'll call you when I have a break between conference calls,

Jonna

On Tue, Aug 1, 2017 at 9:05 AM, Kevin Olival, PhD <olival@ecohealthalliance.org> wrote:

Dear Jonna,

Thank you for your reply. I completely understand and agree with all the points you made, and would have had the same immediate concerns myself if I received this, as presented, from someone else on our team. I apologize and accept full responsibility for not bringing this to your and PREDICT management's attention sooner. This was an error in judgement on my part for not flagging this immediately, and going through the proper channels, when I first spotted the inclusion of P1 data in mid-July.

Please allow me to briefly contextualize this, in terms of the paper's intent and the short timeline we have been working with. This invited *Diversity* manuscript was never originally intended to be a global PREDICT paper, nor to include any PREDICT data. This was meant to be a relatively small, low-impact review paper that Anna could lead on to help build her CV (her first, 1st authored paper) as I didn't have time to do it. We decided that in addition to a review, we should include an targeted analysis of viral richness and sharing in cave bats vs. non-cave bats using publically-available data from the literature. This dataset also ended up including 37 P1 records from HealthMap - as Anna thought it would be a nice way to showcase PREDICT's contribution to the bat—ICTV-recognized virus associations found in the literature. When I first read the manuscript draft about 2.5 weeks ago (mid-July, right before leaving for Indonesia), I should have, but did not, immediate flag the issue that P1 host-virus associations were included in the updated dataset. I am keenly aware of the sensitivities and concerns regarding PREDICT data from our global and US partners, and in no way intended to undermine that. I spend much of every day and take pride, as we all do, in ensuring that our PREDICT work is collaborative and meets the needs and requests of our global and in-country partners. The paper went out for review and was back to us in about 10 days. I then reviewed the ms for the 2nd time (after my coauthors included edits from the two reviewers, on July 29th). This was the same day I sent the email to you and David, and at that point I realized that we need to get buy-in for including the P1 data before publishing this.

I see several ways to fix this before it's published and ensure this won't happen again, including the course of action you suggest. I look forward to discussing these. Please call my office line or mobile anytime today, or text me a time that's best for you.

I have been working hard over the last several years to ensure that the M&A team is both collaborative (working across organizations and with in-country partners) and showing value across the project. I sincerely hope that we can, as you suggest, "chalk this up as a learning experience" and move forward with a positive and open collaboration for the rest of P2 and beyond.

Regards,
Kevin

Kevin J. Olival, PhD

Associate Vice President for Research

EcoHealth Alliance
460 West 34th Street – 17th floor
New York, NY 10001

1.212.380.4478 (direct)
REDACTED (mobile)
1.212.380.4465 (fax)
@nycbat (twitter)
www.ecohealthalliance.org

EcoHealth Alliance leads cutting-edge research into the critical connections between human and wildlife health and delicate ecosystems. With this science we develop solutions that promote conservation and prevent pandemics.

On Jul 31, 2017, at 8:20 PM, Jonna Mazet <jkmazet@ucdavis.edu> wrote:

Hi Kevin,
We better discuss by phone tomorrow. As you say, there is nothing technically wrong with using publicly available data to develop manuscripts. However, not telling anyone or including anyone who collected the samples or analyzed them as a co-author is a breach of our internal project agreement to include each other and inform on global papers. My main concern is that publishing this paper in this way, after we've promised up and down to include relevant leads and in-country people will hamper your ability to serve as a trusted M&A lead for the project, and I am quite sure that people will ask me to not allow you (and perhaps EHA) to access their P-2 data pre-public release, which I have just asked MB to do once an for all. That could severely impact our M&A team's abilities to function well for the program.
Quite weirdly coincidental that I see this email on the same day that I put my foot down and asked everyone to trust you. Don't get me wrong, I don't see any mal-intent in your actions, suffice it to say that your instincts that enabled you to proceed this far (for weeks or months) threaten your ability to functionally serve in a collaborative leadership position, but not as a great scientist. I suggest you consider chalking this one up as a learning experience that it is best to check-in early on these things, where your natural judgement may not always align with that of

expectations of others and promises made at high levels before you joined those ranks. Depending on what you decide on role moving forward, I think it might be best to ask the journal for an extension, add this to the EB agenda, make your apologies there, and consider co-author inclusions (at least Predict Consortium and also some in-country leads for countries where you pulled data).

Happy to discuss further with you tomorrow,
Jonna

On Sat, Jul 29, 2017 at 6:10 PM, Kevin Olival, PhD <olival@ecohealthalliance.org> wrote:
Dear Jonna and David,

Just wanted to give you a heads up, and hopefully get your rapid OK, on a paper that was not included on the last round of the PREDICT publication list. This is a recently invited manuscript for a special issue "Microbial diversity in caves" for the online journal *Diversity,* that I had little turn around time on - and we just finished the first draft and first round of reviews (they reviewed in less than 2 weeks!). I tasked Anna to lead on this one, and she did a great job pulling together the analyses and the main text. We also included another graduate student, Kendra, who has lots of experience with cave roosting bats and helped with the literature review.

The study is largely based on the HP3 published database (it's really just a more detailed, subset analysis to fit this special "cave microbial diversity" issue). The data include additional references Anna pulled from the literature to update that dataset, and also n=37 bat - ICTV-recognized virus associations (about 6% of our dataset) from the public HealthMap PREDICT website. I figured since these data are publicly-relseased and no other information besides virus name and species name were used that this would be okay to include. I'm attaching the latest draft of the paper and the Supplementary Table 1 that shows the data used. We are hoping to resubmit this ms ASAP (as they gave me a very narrow window for this). We are fully acknowledging this as a PREDICT paper, and hope PREDICT-global (UCD) is okay with this? Please let me know. Submission was due yesterday, but I'll wait to hear back from you all before sending anything back in.

Thanks!
Kevin